

Appln No. 10/666,119  
Amdt. Dated July 1, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 12, 2004

3

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Office Action dated May 12, 2004.

### **AMENDMENTS**

Claim 1 has been amended to specify that the keyboard comprises an external port for connecting the keyboard to a separately housed computer via a connector. Basis for this amendment can be found in Figure 1 (see USB connector 56) and at page 5, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph and page 5, final paragraph. Corresponding amendments have been made to Claim 5.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC § 103**

The Applicant contests the Examiner's assertion that the present invention is obvious in view of Tateyama et al (US 5,845,144), and further in view of Hawkins et al (US 6,312,099).

The present invention relates to a keyboard for a computer system having a pagewidth printer disposed therein. In this context, the term "keyboard" is intended to mean a keyboard console, which can be connected to a separately housed computer via, for example, a USB connector. In the vast majority of computer systems, the main computer is connected to a monitor and a keyboard console via USB connectors. This arrangement allows the computer to be stored underneath a desk, thereby saving on desk space in the office.

It is abundantly clear from the specification and the drawings of the present application that the term "keyboard" is intended to mean a separate keyboard console of the type described above, rather than an internal keyboard, which forms part of an integrated computer system comprising a monitor, keyboard and computer housed in a single casing (such as those found in laptop computers).

The Applicant considers the term "keyboard", in the context of the present application, to be distinguished from the types of keyboards found in laptop computers. Nevertheless, in deference to the Examiner's objection, Claim 1 has been amended to make it explicitly clear that the keyboard being claimed is not part of an integrated computer system, such as a laptop computer. In particular, Claim 1 now specifies that the keyboard comprises "an external port on the housing for connecting the keyboard to a separately housed computer

Appln No. 10/666,119  
Amdt. Dated July 1, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 12, 2004

4

via a connector". It is submitted that this amendment to Claim 1 leaves no ambiguity as to the intended meaning of the term "keyboard".

Having clarified the scope of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is not obvious in view of the cited prior art documents.

*Tateyama et al (US 5,845,144)*

This document discloses a typical laptop computer comprising an internal printer. In other words, Tateyama describes an integrated computer system comprising a computer, a monitor, a keyboard and a printer.

In the first place, the Applicant submits that Tateyama does not describe "a keyboard comprising a printer". Tateyama merely discloses an integrated computer system comprising a keyboard and a printer. The two are quite clearly not the same, because in Tateyama the keyboard forms part of an integrated computer system that also happens to comprise a printer. However, there is no sense in which the printer forms part of the keyboard in Tateyama; rather, they both form part of a larger integrated system. This is a crucial distinction that the Examiner does not appear to have appreciated in his Office Action.

In the second place, Claim 1 now contains features which explicitly distinguish the keyboard being presently claimed from the type of integrated computer system described in Tateyama. The keyboard of the present invention comprises an external port on the housing for connecting the keyboard to a separately housed computer via a connector, such as a USB connector lead. Hence, the keyboard of the present invention is clearly distinguished from the integrated keyboard arrangement shown on the front page of Tateyama.

Moreover, Tateyama does not envisage a separate keyboard console having print functionality. Tateyama is interested only in a fully integrated laptop computer with print capability. Tateyama does not address the problem of saving deskpace, neither does it teach the solution of incorporating a printer into the keyboard console of a conventional computer system.

Hitherto, it had not been recognized in the art that keyboard consoles may be usefully adapted to provide print capability and, hence, save on deskpace. There is no suggestion in

Appln No. 10/666,119  
Amdt. Dated July 1, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 12, 2004

5

Tateyama to modify conventional keyboard consoles by incorporating a pagewidth printer therein. Tateyama teaches only modification of a laptop computer, which coincidentally (and inevitably) comprises an integrated keyboard. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious from the disclosure of Tateyama.

Hawkins et al (6,312,099)

As regards Hawkins, this document merely describes a pagewidth printer. There is no suggestion in Hawkins that such printers may be incorporated into keyboard consoles. Moreover, the combination of Hawkins and Tateyama would not lead the skilled person to arrive at the present invention. The combination of Hawkins and Tateyama, if anything, would only lead the skilled person to a laptop computer incorporating a pagewidth printer. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present invention is not obvious from the combination of Hawkins and Tateyama.

Isobe et al (5,579,092)

As regards Isobe, this document has been included in the Office Action merely because it is alleged to disclose the feature of an endless belt driven by a roller assembly, as specified in present Claim 4. Since it is submitted that Claim 1 is not obvious in view of the cited prior art, it is further submitted that the remaining Claims dependent on Claim 1 are, likewise, not obvious.

Appln No. 10/666,119  
Amdt. Dated July 1, 2004  
Response to Office action of May 12, 2004

6

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

TOBIN ALLEN KING



---

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o:

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email:

kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone:

+612 9818 6633

Facsimile:

+61 2 9555 7762